

Application No. 10/736,841  
Amendment dated April 10, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2007

Docket No.: 5486-0134PUS1

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to .

Attachment:      Replacement sheet

### REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-4 and 8-21 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 8-10 have been canceled and claims 1, 3, 11, 20 and 21 have been amended through this Reply. Therefore, claims 1-4 and 11-21 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seeks timely allowance of all pending claims.

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting a personal interview with the Applicant's representative on March 15, 2007. During the interview, Applicant's representative pointed out the differences between the applied prior art references and the claimed invention of independent claims 1, 8, and 11. The Examiner agreed that none of the prior art references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention of claims 1 and 11 and agreed to withdraw the prior art rejections of those claims. However, during the interview, the Examiner contended that claims 1 and 11 are not clear. Although the Applicant's representative did not agree with the Examiner's contention that the claims are unclear, it was agreed that claim 1 would be amended by replacing "loop(s)" with "trace(s)" and adding the phrase "to form a loop between the first array of sensing traces and the second array of sensing traces" and claim 11 would be amended by adding the phrase "wherein the first and second pluralities of sensing traces form first conductive loops, and wherein the third and fourth pluralities of sensing traces form second conductive loops" in order to expedite prosecution. No agreement was reached regarding the rejection of claim 8.

### AMENDMENT

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended as agreed upon during the interview. The amendments made to the claims do not add any new matter to the application and do not raise any new issues. Support for the amendments can be found on paragraphs [24]-[25] of the specification. Furthermore, claims 3, 20, and 21 have been amended merely to address informal issues and to enhance clarity.

## DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to the drawings because Figs. 1 and 2 allegedly should have been designated by a legend such as "PRIOR ART". Drawing corrections are filed concurrently herewith in which the legend "PRIOR ART" has been added to Figs. 1 and 2. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

## REJECTION UNDER § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly not meeting the enablement requirement. The Examiner asserts that the specification is not enabling for claims to a "second sensing array of sensing loops each coupled between the processor and a second potential node" as recited in claim 3. During the interview on March 15, 2007, Applicant's representative demonstrated that Figs. 5 and 7-10 along with their detailed descriptions clearly satisfy the enable requirement for such claim. As mentioned on the Interview Summary, the Examiner agreed to withdraw this rejection upon filing this response. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 – Yamanami, Tamura, Blesser

A. Claims 1-4 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanami et al. (US 4,878,553) in view of Tamura et al. (US 4,571,454). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a first array of sensing traces each coupled between the processor and a first potential node, each sensing trace in the first array being selectively connectable to the processor and further being selectively connectable to the first potential node; and a second array of sensing traces each coupled between the processor and the first potential node, each sensing trace in the second array being selectively connectable to the processor and further being selectively connectable to the first potential node to form a loop between the first array of sensing traces and the second array of sensing traces". As acknowledged by the Examiner during the interview on March 15, 2007, none of the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least the above identified claim feature. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection of independent claim 1 based on Yamanami and Tamura.

Claims 8-10 have been canceled and thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly. Thus, these claims are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

B. Claims 11-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamnami et al. (US 4,878,553) in view of Blesser (US 4,694,124) and further in view of Tamura et al. (US 4,571,454). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Amended independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the first and second pluralities of sensing traces form first conductive loops, and wherein the third and fourth pluralities of sensing traces form second conductive loops". As acknowledged by the Examiner during the interview on March 15, 2007, none of the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least the above identified claim feature. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection of independent claim 11 based on Yamanami, Blesser, and Tamura.

Claims 12-21 depend from claim 11 directly or indirectly. Thus, these claims are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 11.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No. 10/736,841  
Amendment dated April 10, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2007

Docket No : 5486-0134PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #58,755  
for Michael K. Mutter  
Registration No.: 29,680  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments